

State of Utah

Department of Natural Resources

MICHAEL R. STYLER Executive Director

Division of Oil, Gas & Mining

JOHN R. BAZA Division Director JON M. HUNTSMAN, JR. Governor

> GARY R. HERBERT Lieutenant Governor

> > September 27, 2006

Fred or Marty Holley
H & H Stone
P. O. Box 250
Dove Creek, Colorado 81324

Subject: Incomplete Reclamation, H & H Stone, Little Indian Mine, M0370117, San

Juan County, Utah

Dear Messrs. Holley:

The Division is in receipt of a note written on your annual permit fee billing statement saying the reference mine has been reclaimed and that no mining has occurred since 2004. Division inspector Paul Baker examined the site on June 13, 2006, and found that reclamation had not been finished. Much of the site had been regraded and seeded, but some overburden or topsoil stockpiles were not regraded. A copy of the inspection report is enclosed.

The R647 rules require a period of three years following seeding before a site can be released from further responsibilities under the Mined Land Reclamation Act. The purpose of this period is to ensure that vegetation becomes adequately established, and **permit fees need to be paid during that three-year period**. Once the three years have elapsed, the Division will evaluate the vegetation and determine whether it meets release criteria (vegetation cover is 70 percent of adjacent undisturbed areas).

Enclosed is another copy of the billing statement. Please submit the payment by October 27, 2006.

Division rules now require operators to submit reclamation sureties for all mining and exploration operations, but the Division recognizes that limited reclamation needs to be done at the Little Indian Quarry. Therefore, if regrading and seeding are completed before December 1, 2006, the Division will waive the requirement for you to submit a surety.

Page 2 Fred or Marty Holley S/037/117 September 27, 2006

If you have questions about this letter or about reclamation requirements, please call Paul Baker at 801-538-5261. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely, Juxan M. White

Susan M. White

Mining Program Coordinator Minerals Regulatory Program

SMW:PBB:pb

Enclosure: June 13, 2006, inspection report

c: John Blake, SITLA

 $P.\GROUPS\MINERALS\WP\M037-SanJuan\S0370117-H\&H\final\ltr-reclamation-09202006.doc$



Sta. of **Utah**DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES Division of Oil, Gas & Mining

MICHAEL R. STYLER Executive Director JOHN R. BAZA Division Director

Inspection Report Minerals Regulatory Program Report Date July 19, 2006

Supervisor	
------------	--

Report Date stary 19, 20

Mine Name: Little Indian Operator Name: H & H Stone	Permit number: M0370117 Inspection Date: June 13, 2006 Time: 4:35-4:50 PM		
Inspector(s): Paul Baker			
Other Participants: None			
Mine Status: Mostly reclaimed	Weather:	Mostly sunny	, 80s
Elements of Inspection	Evaluated	Comment	Enforcement
 Permits, Revisions, Transfer, Bonds Public Safety (shafts, adits, trash, signs, highwalls) Protection of Drainages / Erosion Control Deleterious Material Roads (maintenance, surfacing, dust control, safety) Concurrent Reclamation Backfilling/Grading (trenches, pits, roads, 			
highwalls, shafts, drill holes) 8. Water Impoundments	\boxtimes	\boxtimes	
9. Soils 10. Revegetation 11. Air Quality			

Purpose of Inspection:

This site was to have been reclaimed in 2005, and I wanted to see whether grading was adequate and if the vegetation was progressing.

Inspection Summary:

5. Roads

12. Other

A road runs through the middle of the reclaimed area. This road existed prior to any mining, and the original notice of intention identified that this road would remain following reclamation.

7. Backfilling/Grading (trenches, pits, roads, highwalls, shafts, drill holes)

The mine site has little relief, and most of the area has been graded to blend with surrounding areas (Photo 1). On the north and east sides of the area, however, there are overburden or soil piles that were not graded (Photos 2 and 3). I do not know why this was not done; I am fairly confident these piles were made as part of the mining operation. This seems to be verified by pictures I took in 2003 (Photos 6-7).

8. Impoundments

A small impoundment had been created just upstream from the mine, and it has now been breached. I would rather that the operator had spread material from the dam over nearby areas, but I am not terribly concerned how this was done.

10. Revegetation

Inspection Date: June 13, 2006; Report Date: July 19, 2006

Page 2 of 2 M0370117

Vegetation appeared to be coming in very well. I found seedlings everywhere there was soil (Photos 4 and 5). As one would expect, there are also lots of weeds, but the weeds I found are not noxious or overly competitive. I fully expect good vegetation cover within a few years in those areas that were graded and seeded.

Conclusions and Recommendations:

The operator needs to finish grading and seeding the site.

Inspector's Signature /

Date: 9 28 06

Directions to Site:

Directions are given in one of the previous inspection reports. A gate along the access road was locked, and I had to walk about 1.5 miles to get to the site.

PBB:pb

Fred Holley, Operator

John Blake, SITLA

Attachment: Photos

ATTACHMENT

Photographs

M0370117, Little Indian Mine, H & H Stone

Inspection Dated: June 13, 2006; Report Dated: July 19, 2006



Photo 1. An overview of a portion of the site.



Photo 2. Overburden or soil piles on the north side of the mine.



Photo 3. Overburden or soil piles on the west side of the mine.



Photo 4. Perennial vegetation had germinated and was progressing well although there were some weeds.

Page 2 M0370117 Little Indian Mine

Inspection Date: June 13, 2006; Report Date: July 19, 2006



Photo 5. This is where the main drainage comes into the mine area from the southwest side of the quarry. The dam was breached, but material was not spread out.



Photo 6. This and Photo 7 show soil/overburden piles in 2003. This all appears to be fresh disturbance.



Photo 7.